

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1456

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP SUITE 1800 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET ARLINGTON VA 22209

COPY MAILED

APR 1 2 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of Mahesh S. Natu

Application No. 09/746,200

Filed: December 26, 2000

Attorney Docket Number: 219.39042X00

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed March 31, 2005, to revive the above identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply to the non-Final Office Action mailed July 30, 2004. A shortened statutory period of three months was set for replying to the non-Final Office Action. No extensions of time having been requested, this application became abandoned October 31, 2004. Accordingly, a Notice of Abandonment was mailed February 23, 2005.

Petitioner files the instant petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b). 1

This application is being forwarded to Technology Center 2115 for appropriate action on the amendment filed March 31, 2005.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to the undersigned Petitions Attorney at (571) 272-3212.

Patricia Faison-Ball

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions

¹Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

⁽¹⁾ the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

⁽²⁾ the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

⁽³⁾ a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may required additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and